

## REMARKS

In the Office Action having a mailing date of May 21, 2004, the Examiner rejected various claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 as being indefinite, but not for reasons relating to patentability. The Applicant submits that the claim amendments made hereinabove obviate the basis for rejection. For example, in relation to Claim 1, it should be clear that the referenced "signature" is that which is detected as a function of image collection time. In this regard, Applicant notes that the present specification provides ample related description, including for example and without limitation, language found at page 5, line 1 through page 6, line 18. In relation to independent Claim 48, language has been introduced to stipulate that the enhanced information relates to the "low-intensity scatterer" referenced in such Claim.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Thomas R. Marsh  
Registration No. 31,039  
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411  
Aurora, Colorado 80014  
Telephone: (303) 338-0997  
Facsimile: (303) 338-1514

Date: September 21, 2004